DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 212 047 EA 014 320

AUTHOR Wholeben, Brent E.; And Others
TITLE Validating Educational Programs for Exportability across State Lines. A Manual for Implementing IVP.
PUB DATE Jun 80
NOTE 43p.; For a related document, see EA 014 321.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Demonstration Programs; *Educational Assessment; *Evaluation Methods; *Program Validation; Records (Forms); Success
IDENTIFIERS *Interstate Validation Process

ABSTRACT

The Interstate Validation Process (IVP--)is a method of validating educational practices for dissemination across state lines. The IVP was developed because no validation procedures for disseminating non-federally-funded programs were accepted by all states in the U.S. Department of Education's Region X, and because it was felt that such procedures could be developed. The authors identify the critical elements in the IVP, including cost-effectiveness and interstate acceptability, and list the types of evidence needed to prove a program successful, such as documented changes in student learning, attainment of managerial effectiveness, and improvements in staff utilization. An overview of the IVP procedure notes the steps in the process and the need for qualifications and training for the personnel carrying out the validations. The steps in the IVP include applicant information, an abstract of the project, and evidence of success and of "exportability" across state lines. Evidence of exportability is determined by programs' educational significance, target population, costs, and requirements for staff and equipment. The manual also provides sample forms for the IVP steps and a sample IVP team report. (RW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED212047

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Robert L. Workman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

VALIDATING EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS FOR EXPORTABILITY ACROSS STATE LINES

A Manual For Implementing IVP

Dr. Brent E. Wholeben
Associate Director,
Bureau of School Service and Research
University of Washington

Robert L. Workman
Dissemination Division Staff
Region X, U.S. Department of Education

Dr. Robert A. Radford
Director,
Dissemination Division
Region X, U.S. Department of Education

Seattle, Washington

June 1980

EA 014 320

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	1
Assumptions for An Interstate Validation Process	1
Critical Elements of an Interstate Validation Process	2
Overview of the Interstate Validation Procedure	3
Steps in the Process	3
Qualifications for Interstate Validation	4
Training of IVP Personnel	5
Application for Interstate Validation	5
Applicant Information	6
Project Abstract	7
Evidence of Effectiveness/Success	8
Purpose and Objectives	9
Program Activities	10
Evaluation Design	11
Results and Analysis	12
Evidence of Exportability	13
Educational Significance	13
Target Population	14
Minimum Adoption or Replication Requirements	14
Cost Statement	14
Staffing and Training Requirments	17
Materials, Equipment, and Facilities	19
Special Problems	21

APPENDIX: INTERSTATE VALIDATION TEAM REPORT

Introduction

The concept of validating promising educational practices for dissemination is not a new one. There are two quality control processes presently being used on the national level, The Identification, Validation, Dissemination (IVD) Process and The Joint Dissemination Review Panel (JDRP) Process. Individual states also have validation processes of varying degrees of sophistication for their own internal uses; yet there has been no formal mechanism for the interchange or dissemination of educational practices among the states except through the Natonal Diffusion Network (NDN).

Assumptions for an Interstate Validation Process

The Dissemination Division of Region X, U.S. Department of Education, perceived that an Interstate Validation Process (IVP) reflecting a high degree of acceptability could provide a service for its constituency which would be more readily available, more cost-effective, and more appropriate in meeting local needs and problems. This led to the following four assumptions:

1. There was not a model or process for interstate validation of promising educational practices, commonly accepted by the four SEAs.

2. There was not a vehicle for the diffusion of validated promising practices across state lines except through the Joint Dissemination Review Panel (JDRP) process.

3. There were other promising educational practices worthy of replication, in addition to those that were federally funded.

4. A common method for validating promising educational programs and for establishing a bank of educational programs, products, and processes within Region X could be developed which would provide a more cost-effective and efficient procedure.

A draft instrument of an Interstate Validation Process (IVP) was developed utilizing the Sharing Educational Success (SES) Handbook, the Sharing Business Success (SBS) Handbook, and the validation procedures utilized by the four states of the Region. This draft was subjected to a field test in each of the four states, the results of which of which were analyzed to produce a revised instrument. The revised instrument was also subjected to a field test, in Washington state, analyzed and modified resulting in this proposed manual for an Interstate Validation Process. The procedures and results of the field tests are available from the Region X Dissemination Division, Seattle, Washington.

Critical Elements of an Interstate Validation Process

Several elements were identified as being essential to the installation and management of an IVP. They are the following:

1. Develop an IVP design or process that reflects interstate agreement

2. Design a cost-effective process

3. Identify a cadre of professionals at the state and local levels who are trained in validation methodology in order to ensure quality control of the validation standards

4. Locate the responsibility for the administration of the IVP in a setting that encourages cooperation across funding-source lines.

Evidence of educational success can be demonstrated in a number of ways. Viable evidence of a successful program, practice, or product may include:

1. Documented change in student learning

2. Attainment of management effectiveness

3. Cost-effective practices

4. Improvements in staff utilization

Educational significance of a project should be determined in terms of its potential for solving educational problems. Successful completion of the interstate process would result in entry into the Interstate Bank of Promising Educational Practices.

Overview of the Interstate Validation Procedure

Steps in the Process

1. The IVP proposed to utilize SEAs to survey prospective LEAs for identification of promising programs, practices, or products.

2. The SEA submits application for validation to the Interstate Review Committee (IRC).

3. The application for validation is reviewed by the IRC, with a recommendation to:

   a) Approve for on-site team review, or

   b) Offer technical assistance to the project developer-site

4. Upon approval by the IRC, an Interstate Validation Review Team (IVT) will be formed. The team will be composed of a team leader and a minimum of two team members selected from the list of trained validators.

5. The IVT conducts an off-site review of the IRC-approved application. This may be done as individuals in isolation from other team members or the team may be convened to review the application. At the conclusion of the review, the IVT may:

   a) Accept the IRC-approved application for on-site validation

   b) Make recommendatins to the LEA that identified revisions are to be completed before the on-site verification.

6. The IVT conducts on-site verification of the evidence presented in the application.

7. The team recommends to the IRC one or more of the following:

   a) approval, or

   b) disapproval.

8. If approved:

   a) The program is included in the state and interstate dissemination networks

   b) The program may be eligible for submission to the Joint Dissemination Review Panel (JDRP)

9. If disapproved:

   The IRC returns the application and validation report, including the reasons for disapproval, to the SEA

Qualifications for Interstate Validators

One of the critical elements in the validation process is the selection and use of qualified validators. Interstate team members should be:

1. Experienced in program development, implementation, and evaluation

2. Certified by the appropriate agency (state or federal) as a trained validator

Training of IVP Personnel

It is proposed that the training of validation team members should be a collaborative effort between the Regional Office of Education staff and respective State Departments of Education.

All validators must have completed IVP training and be certified before conducting an on-site visit.

Application for Interstate Validation

Preparation of the application is an important step in the process. Thoroughness and accuracy are means to determine the merits of a validatable program, and ultimately contributes to whether or not it is validated.

The application for Interstate validation will address the following areas:

- Applicant Information
- Project Abstract
- Evidence of Effectiveness/Success
- Evidence of Exportability

Applicant Information

Area of concern _____
(e.g., Career Education, Handicapped, Reading, etc.)

Project Title _____

Project Director's Name _____

_____
(Address) (City) (State) (Zip Code)

Phone Number (include area code) _____

Applicant Agency _____

Location _____
(Street Address) (City) (State) (Zip Code)

Phone Number (include area code) _____

Superintendent's Name _____

_____
(Address) (City) (State) (Zip Code)

Phone Number (include area code) _____

Project Abstract

The abstract should be a VERY BRIEF SUMMARY (not more than one page) which includes the essence of the following key elements:

- Brief statement of the problem
- Objective(s)
- Needs
- Action(s) taken
- Results
- Project significance
- Project costs
- Exportability

Evidence of Effectiveness/Success

Documented evidence of effectiveness or success of a program, practice, or product is of critical importance in the application for validation.

There should be, incorporated into the subject of effectiveness/success, answers which provide convincing evidence to the following key questions:

- Did a change occur?
- Was the effect significant, measureable, and defensible/supportable?
- Can the project be implemented in another location with a reasonable expectation of comparable impact?
- How likely is it that the observed effects resulted from the intervention?
- Is the evidence presented believable and interpretable?

A program or practice can be "proven to work" in numerous ways including:

- Convincing evidence that the program will bring about desired change or improvement over existing practices.
- Convincing evidence of a more efficient or cost-effective program practice through improved management and resource utilization.

In each of the foregoing, the key concept is convincing evidence which demands the most credible standards of proof possible within the context of the organizational setting.

Evidence of effectiveness/success may be presented as follows:

- Purpose and Objectives
- Program Activities
- Evaluation Design
- Results and Analysis

Purpose and Objectives

The applicant should identify the major purpose of the program or practice. This statement should give a broad perspective of the project so that the reviewer may better understand how the inclusion or exclusion of any single objective may affect the overall or major purpose.

The objective statement should be simple and straight forward, not requiring delineation of specific dimensions or levels. An example might be: "The purpose of Project AAA is to increase the basic reading skills for the handicapped in School District A" or "The general purpose of Project AAA is to reduce sex role stereotyping of job options for elementary students in School District A".

The application should include a list of anticipated changes or objectives of the program. Ordinarily major objectives are limited to not more than three or four. They may include cognitive, affective (attitudinal) or psychomotor behavioral changes.

Product objectives should be stated in measureable terms reflecting who, upon completion of the program, will be able to do what, at what level of performance. Objectives should be written in such a manner that evidence may be systematically gathered to reflect their attainment.

Ordinarily, process or enabling objectives alone will not provide sufficient evidence to validate the success of a project. The applicant should describe how the major objectives are interrelated and if they are of equal importance.

Objectives that are absolutely essential to the project's success must be known.

If the formative evaluation revealed the need to modify or delete any objectives of the project, explain such changes. The response to this item may give the reviewer a better understanding of the developmental nature of this project and its relationship to the stated purpose.

Program Activities

The applicant should describe the activity(ies), using the following key elements as guides:

- What the learner did differently
- What the teacher did differently
- Use of traditional or non-traditional materials
- Special management plan(s)
- Frequency of duration and intensity of process (i.e., daily schedule)
- Involvement of parents and/or community

Evaluation Design

The applicant should establish that the evaluation instruments or data gathering techniques utilized were valid, reliable, and sensitive.

The instruments utilized represent the operational definition of the objectives. Thus the validity, reliability, and sensitivity of the data gathering devices are of signal importance. If standardized instruments are used, the technical data are available within the manual and can be briefly summarized with appropriate references.

If the instruments were "tailor made" the procedure should be briefly described, citing the way in which the instrument was validated, how reliability or consistency was determined, as well as characteristics such as range, freedom from offensiveness, administration and interpretation guidelines, etc.

If norm-referenced tests were utilized, the norms should be described. If criterion-referenced instruments were used, the manner in which criteria levels were set should be noted. Evaluation or data gathering devices may include tests, controlled observation, rating scales, checklists, etc. If such devices are utilized, the above technical considerations should be carefully reported.

The following format is suggested for each instrument:

- Test or data gathering device
- Validity
- Reliability
- Norm group (if normreferenced tests)

- Criteria levels (if criterionreferenced tests)
- Other relevant characteristic

Results and Analysis

Relate the results to specific objectives, both process and product. Indicate whether the results met or varied from expectations.

The following format would be helpful in responding to this item:

- Expected change or anticipated outcome
- Actual change or results. Utilize charts, graphics, statistical summaries where appropriate
- Significance of results either statistical or otherwise. If other than statistical, provide rationale for evaluation of significance

The applicant should describe overall project results, which includes:

- An estimate of educational or practical significance of findings
- A brief interpretation of results

Report unanticipated outcomes of major importance and significance. Include in this item, spinoff or unplanned changes that took place as a result of this project.

Evidence of Exportability

There should be evidence that the program, practice, or product exhibits those characteristics that reveal its essence to another setting with similar needs and environments for possible replication. The documented success of a program is an essential part in making that program available for diffusion. This section of the application should identify and document the program's capability to diffuse a successful program.

The proposed outline for describing exportability is as follows:

- Educational Significance
- Target Population
- Minimum Adoption or Replication Requirements
- Cost Statement
- Staffing and Training Requirements
- Materials, Equipment, and Facilities

Educational Significance

Consider some of the following questions in responding to this item:

- Why is the project important?

- Does it solve an educational problem of importance to the general educational community?
- How widespread is the problem addressed?
- Does it meet real educational needs of students?

Target Population

The applicant should describe the appropriate learner population for the replication of the program. Also, the applicant should detail any unique variables about the community, school, or population that influenced the success of the program. Finally, are these variables limiting factors that should influence the decision to replicate the program?

Minimum Adoption or Replication Requirements

The applicant should describe what constitutes a minimum level replication of the program that would produce results similar to those documented as successful in the application. The applicant should note whether there are parts or components of the program that could be replicated in the absence of others?

Cost Statement

Adopters are keenly interested in the costs required for the initiation or startup of a new program and for the cost necessary for ongoing operation and management. For these reasons, this section is intended to provide information on the types and quantities of resources necessary for successful adoption of a program or practice. From this information, potential adopters can estimate their individual costs for startup and operation.

Startup and operational costs are defined as follows:

- Startup Costs are any allowable cost that an adopter would incur (on a onetime basis only) to begin operations necessary to carry out the program.

- Operational Costs are the total of daily expenditures related to carrying out the program.

NOTE: See suggested Form #1

Suggested Form #1

COST STATEMENT

ESTIMATED REPLICATION COSTS

Item	Start-up	Operational	Comments/Descriptio
Personnel see p.			
Staff Development see p.			
Materials see p.			
Equipment see p.			
Facilities see p.			
Contracted Services* see p.			
Other see p.			
Indirect Costs _____ %			
Total			

*Describe Contracted Services

Staffing and Training Requirements (see suggested forms #2 and 2A)

The applicant should describe any special staffing necessary to replicate the program. Also, the applicant should describe any training or assistance program personnel would provide to a new site. The applicant should indicate whether the special staff requirements would generally be available among a school staff? And finally, can the training be performed in time periods that would not significantly disrupt the replication site schedule?

Suggested Form #2

Qualifications and Numbers of Personnel*

Title of Personnel	Number	Full Time Equivalency	Function	Special Qualifications

*Complete a Form for each component which can be adopted separately.

Suggested Form #2A

Minimum Level of Training Required to Adopt Each Component*

Personnel to be trained	Skills to be taught	Organization of training, including length of time	Material and equipment to be used

*Complete a Form for each component which can be adopted.

Materials, Equipment, and Facilities

Suggested Form #3

Essential Materials*

Type of Materials	User	Quantity	Source

*Complete a Form for each component if the practice can be adopted in parts.

Suggested Form #3A

Essential Equipment and Facilities*

Type and description of equipment and facilities	User	Quanity	Service

*Complete a form for each component if the practice can be adopted in parts.

Special Problems

The applicant should detail any special problems that are likely to be encountered in the replication and operation of the program. In addition, the applicant should provide information on the following:

- How were these problems overcome in the developer setting?
- How could they be avoided in the replication?

APPENDIX

INTERSTATE VALIDATION TEAM

REPORT

_____

NAME OF PROJECT

_____

NAME AND ADDRESS

_____

SUBMITTING SCHOOL DISTRICT

IVT FORM

Validation Team Report

I. Applicant Information

	YES	NO
Program information appears complete and accurate.	☐	☐

ITEMS IN THIS SECTION NEEDING ON-SITE CLARIFICATION

II. Project Abstract

	YES	NO
Abstract is clear and reflects focus and results of the program.	☐	☐

NOTE: The abstract should contain the essence of such key elements as a brief statement of the problem, major objectives, needs, actions, results, significance, costs, and exportability.

ITEMS IN THIS SECTION NEEDING ON-SITE CLARIFICATION

III. Evidence of Effectiveness/Success

A. Purpose and objectives

	YES	NO
1. Major purpose of program is clearly stated.	☐	☐
2. Program objectives are clearly stated.	☐	☐
3. Change criteria are clearly specified.	☐	☐
4. Interrelationship of objectives clearly explained.	☐	☐

ITEMS IN THIS SECTION NEEDING ON-SITE CLARIFICATION

	YES	NO
Purpose and objective section acceptable for validation	☐	☐

B. Program Activities

	YES	NO
1. Learner activities are well defined.	☐	☐
2. Teacher activities are well defined.	☐	☐
3. Material utilization is described.	☐	☐
4. Management plan is adequately detailed.	☐	☐
5. Frequency, duration, and intensity are described.	☐	☐
6. Use of parents and/or community (are/is) described.	☐	☐

ITEMS IN THIS SECTION NEEDING ON-SITE CLARIFICATION

	YES	NO
Program activities section acceptable for validation	☐	☐

C. Evaluation Design

	YES	NO
1. Evaluation design is valid and appropriate for the project.	☐	☐
2. Evaluation instruments or data gathering techniques utilized were valid, reliable, and sensitive.	☐	☐
3. Evidence was systematically gathered and recorded.	☐	☐

ITEMS IN THIS SECTION NEEDING ON-SITE CLARIFICATION

	YES	NO
Evaluation Design section acceptable for validation.	☐	☐

D. Results and Analysis

1. Results reported completely and accurately for each objective:

	YES	NO
Objective #1	☐	☐
Objective #2	☐	☐
Objective #3	☐	☐
Objective #4	☐	☐

2. Data were analyzed completely and appropriately:

	YES	NO
Objective #1	☐	☐
Objective #2	☐	☐
Objective #3	☐	☐
Objective #4	☐	☐

3. Results were significant:

	YES	NO
Objective #1	☐	☐
Objective #2	☐	☐
Objective #3	☐	☐

D. Results and Analysis - Continued

4. Unanticipated outcomes of major importance and significance are identified:

	YES	NO
Objective #1	☐	☐
Objective #2	☐	☐
Objective #3	☐	☐
Objective #4	☐	☐

ITEMS IN THIS SECTION NEEDING ON-SITE CLARIFICATION

	YES	NO
Results and analysis section acceptable for validation.	☐	☐

IV. Evidence of Exportability

A. Educational Significance

	YES	NO
1. The purpose of the program reflects a recognized educational need.	☐	☐
2. The program effect is generalizable to other populations	☐	☐
3. The magnitude of change is great enough to be convincing. (e.g., an increase of at least 1/3 of a standard deviation, see IDEABOOK Section V. Criterion III.	☐	☐

ITEMS IN THIS SECTION NEEDING ON-SITE CLARIFICATION

	YES	NO
Educational significance section acceptable for validation.	☐	☐

B. Target Population

	YES	NO
1. Target population is well defined.	☐	☐
2. Unique variables for the population would not significantly limit potential adopters of the program.	☐	☐

ITEMS IN THIS SECTION NEEDING ON-SITE CLARIFICATION

	YES	NO
Target population section acceptable for validation.	☐	☐

C. Minimum Adoption or Replication

	YES	NO
1. Separate components of the program are well defined and identifiable, e.g., assessment, treatment, management, training, etc.	☐	☐
2. A minimum adoption is well defined and represents a reasonable expectation of a replication site.	☐	☐

ITEMS IN THIS SECTION NEEDING ON-SITE CLARIFICATION

	YES	NO
Minimum adoption or replication section acceptable for validation.	☐	☐

D. Replication Costs

	YES	NO
1. Reported replication costs appear to be an accurate estimate of start-up costs.	☐	☐
2. Start-up costs are minimal and within the availability of most replication site resources.	☐	☐

ITEMS IN THIS SECTION NEEDING ON-SITE CLARIFICATION

	YES	NO
Replication costs section acceptable for validation.	☐	☐

E. Staffing and Training Requirements

	YES	NO
1. Special staffing requirements are clearly defined.	☐	☐
2. Special staffing requirements are minimal i.e., existing staff could be retrained.	☐	☐
3. A plan for training staff exists.	☐	☐
4. Program staff will be available for training adopters.	☐	☐

ITEMS IN THIS SECTION NEEDING ON-SITE CLARIFICATION

	YES	NO
Staffing and training section acceptable for validation.	☐	☐

F. Materials, Equipment, Facilities

	YES	NO
1. Essential materials, equipment and facilities are identified. (copies of materials should be available for review by on-site team).	☐	☐
2. Special materials and/or equipment are readily available for purchase or distribution.	☐	☐

ITEMS IN THIS SECTION NEEDING ON-SITE CLARIFICATION

	YES	NO
Materials, equipment, facilities section acceptable for validation.	☐	☐

V. Special Problems

	YES	NO
1. There are no insurmountable problems identified that would prevent a replication of the program.	☐	☐
2. Workable solutions are suggested for major, anticipated problems.	☐	☐

ITEMS IN THIS SECTION NEEDING ON-SITE CLARIFICATION

	YES	NO
Special problems section acceptable for validation.	☐	☐

Summary Sheet

	Section Rating	
	Acceptable	Not Acceptable
I. Information & Overview		
A. Project Information Complete	☐	☐
B. Project Abstract Clear	☐	☐
II. Evidence of Effectiveness/Success		
A. Purpose & Objectives	☐	☐
B. Program Activities	☐	☐
C. Evaluation Design	☐	☐
D. Results & Analysis	☐	☐
III. Evidence of Exportability		
A. Educational Significance	☐	☐
B. Target Population(s)	☐	☐
C. Minimum Adoption Requirements	☐	☐
D. Replication Costs	☐	☐
E. Staffing & Training Requirements	☐	☐
F. Materials, Equipment, & Facilities	☐	☐
G. Special Problems	☐	☐

Team Member Recommendation

Program or practice is not recommended for validation ☐

Program or practice recommended for validation ☐

JDRP submission encouraged ☐

Comments and special recommendations of the Review Team - Include mention of curriculum material or procedures of special merit.

Team Final Recommendation

Program or Practice:

Not recommended ☐

Recommended ☐

JDRP submission encouraged ☐

Sign off by Committee:

Signature of Review Committee:	Address and Telephone Number:
1. _____ (Chairman)	_____
2. _____	_____
3. _____	_____
4. _____	_____

Certification by Chief State School Officer

I hereby certify that:

1. Project: _____
(Title)
in the _____ was visited on _____
(name of local education agency) (date)
by a team of _____ experienced and trained validators.
(No. of team members)

2. The team consisted of:

_____	_____
(Name)	(State)
_____	_____
(Name)	(State)
_____	_____
(Name)	(State)
_____	_____
(Name)	(State)

3. I have examined the team's final report, and based on the data reported, I am satisfied that the project meets all the criteria set forth in the Interstate Validation Process and is hereby declared validated.

_____
(Chief State School Officer)

_____
(Date)

Certification by School Superintendent

Name of Project: _____

School District: _____

Address _____

I hereby certify that the above cited project, which is under my administration, will, if validated, and if State or other funds are available, serve as an interstate demonstration site for a period of at least one calendar year from the date of notification of such selection.

_____

Superintendent of School District

_____

Date